

## Business Notices.

**LADIES' DRESS FURS.**—Wishing to dispose of the balance of our stock of LADIES' DRESS FURS, we offer them at a great discount. **LEAHY & CO.,** 112 Broadway, Astor House, Broadway.

**HOLIDAY GIFTS.—PRINCE'S FROSTING POWDER.**—This is the best and most reliable. **PRINCE'S FROSTING POWDER.**—This is the best and most reliable. **PRINCE'S FROSTING POWDER.**—This is the best and most reliable.

**FURS AT REDUCED PRICES.**—Ladies will find it to their advantage to examine our large stock. Also a fine assortment of HATS, CAPS, &c. **WILLIAM H. KILGORE,** 112 Broadway, Astor House, Broadway.

**SINGER'S SEWING MACHINES.**—Our liberal and extensive stock of SINGER'S SEWING MACHINES, of all kinds, is sold at a great discount. The Sewing Machine, with its presser, is sold at a great discount. The Sewing Machine, with its presser, is sold at a great discount.

**PATENT PATTERNS, AT GREAT REDUCED PRICES.**—The PATENT PATTERNS, of all kinds, are sold at a great discount. The PATENT PATTERNS, of all kinds, are sold at a great discount. The PATENT PATTERNS, of all kinds, are sold at a great discount.

**AN UNPARALLELED TEST!**—The DEFENSE PATENT, No. 122, Patent Office, is sold at a great discount. The DEFENSE PATENT, No. 122, Patent Office, is sold at a great discount. The DEFENSE PATENT, No. 122, Patent Office, is sold at a great discount.

**A WORK ON THE HISTORY, PREVENTION, AND CURE OF THE CHOLERA DURING THE PRESENT EPOCH.**—This is a new and original work, by J. L. PARR & CO., 112 Broadway, Astor House, Broadway.

**CRISTADORO'S HAIR-DYE, VIGOR AND TOUTEN.**—This is a new and original work, by J. L. PARR & CO., 112 Broadway, Astor House, Broadway.

**HOLLOWAY'S PILLS AND OINTMENT AND THE REMEDY FOR THE SALE OF THESE VALUABLE REMEDIES THROUGHOUT THE WORLD.**—This is a new and original work, by J. L. PARR & CO., 112 Broadway, Astor House, Broadway.

**DAYTON, ROBINSON & COBURN.**—This is a new and original work, by J. L. PARR & CO., 112 Broadway, Astor House, Broadway.

**THE TRIBUNE FOR CALIFORNIA.**—This is a new and original work, by J. L. PARR & CO., 112 Broadway, Astor House, Broadway.

**THE TRIBUNE FOR EUROPE.**—This is a new and original work, by J. L. PARR & CO., 112 Broadway, Astor House, Broadway.

**DOINGS IN CONGRESS.**—This is a new and original work, by J. L. PARR & CO., 112 Broadway, Astor House, Broadway.

**THE STEAMER HOWE DUE AT HALIFAX.**—This is a new and original work, by J. L. PARR & CO., 112 Broadway, Astor House, Broadway.

**THE LEGISLATURE OF MAINE YESTERDAY ELECTED SAMUEL WELLS, DEMOCRAT, GOVERNOR OF THAT STATE.**—This is a new and original work, by J. L. PARR & CO., 112 Broadway, Astor House, Broadway.

**NO PROGRESS WAS MADE YESTERDAY IN THE ORGANIZATION OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THIS STATE.**—This is a new and original work, by J. L. PARR & CO., 112 Broadway, Astor House, Broadway.

**SOME INTERESTING NEWS FROM KANSAS WILL BE FOUND IN OUR TELEGRAPHIC DISPATCHES.**—This is a new and original work, by J. L. PARR & CO., 112 Broadway, Astor House, Broadway.

**THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES YESTERDAY REACHED THE NINETY-SECOND BALLOT FOR SPEAKER.**—This is a new and original work, by J. L. PARR & CO., 112 Broadway, Astor House, Broadway.

**POSTMASTER-GENERAL'S REPORT.**—This is a new and original work, by J. L. PARR & CO., 112 Broadway, Astor House, Broadway.

**WAR WITH ENGLAND.**—This is a new and original work, by J. L. PARR & CO., 112 Broadway, Astor House, Broadway.

**THE CLAYTON AND BULWER TREATY.**—This is a new and original work, by J. L. PARR & CO., 112 Broadway, Astor House, Broadway.

**THE CLAYTON AND BULWER TREATY.**—This is a new and original work, by J. L. PARR & CO., 112 Broadway, Astor House, Broadway.

**THE CLAYTON AND BULWER TREATY.**—This is a new and original work, by J. L. PARR & CO., 112 Broadway, Astor House, Broadway.

**THE CLAYTON AND BULWER TREATY.**—This is a new and original work, by J. L. PARR & CO., 112 Broadway, Astor House, Broadway.

**THE CLAYTON AND BULWER TREATY.**—This is a new and original work, by J. L. PARR & CO., 112 Broadway, Astor House, Broadway.

**THE CLAYTON AND BULWER TREATY.**—This is a new and original work, by J. L. PARR & CO., 112 Broadway, Astor House, Broadway.

**THE CLAYTON AND BULWER TREATY.**—This is a new and original work, by J. L. PARR & CO., 112 Broadway, Astor House, Broadway.

**THE CLAYTON AND BULWER TREATY.**—This is a new and original work, by J. L. PARR & CO., 112 Broadway, Astor House, Broadway.

**THE CLAYTON AND BULWER TREATY.**—This is a new and original work, by J. L. PARR & CO., 112 Broadway, Astor House, Broadway.

**THE CLAYTON AND BULWER TREATY.**—This is a new and original work, by J. L. PARR & CO., 112 Broadway, Astor House, Broadway.

**THE CLAYTON AND BULWER TREATY.**—This is a new and original work, by J. L. PARR & CO., 112 Broadway, Astor House, Broadway.

**THE CLAYTON AND BULWER TREATY.**—This is a new and original work, by J. L. PARR & CO., 112 Broadway, Astor House, Broadway.

"partment for the year 1856, which goes further to show that the rates fixed by the Act of March 3, 1851, will not enable the Department to sustain itself from its own revenues." But what are the real facts of the case? In another part of his Report he gives the cost of franking matter going out of the Washington City Post-Office alone, in one month, and shows that, if this month is a fair average, the yearly amount must be \$1,468,586, at a fair average. He admits that this is "less than a fair average estimate for the year at that one Post-Office." He well knows that the full amount of franking matter in a year in the United States was estimated by the Post-Office Committee at not less than \$2,500,000. He gives in one item of the Post-Office revenue the sum of \$700,000 as "the annual appropriation made in compensation of 'mail service to the Government'" while we see by the above that this Government mail service costs the country \$2,500,000. And yet, with these figures before him, he tells the country that the deficit or "excess of expenditure" of the Post-Office was \$2,626,206, a statement that he well knows to be false to the extent of at least \$1,800,000. Indeed, the expenditure for the fiscal year was \$826,206 less than the legitimate income.

What a paltry piece of reasoning the Postmaster-General gives us on this subject of franking. He says the number of letters and documents franked by Members of Congress while absent from the seat of Government has not been estimated, but that it "must be very considerable." As to any suggestions on those franks, which he says "cover 'private correspondence of every description,'" he gives none, but is perfectly noncommittal. And yet hardly ever had any public officer the opportunity of doing more for the country or for his own credit than the Postmaster-General in this very particular. But the golden opportunity has gone, and to him it will never return.

When Mr. Rowland Hill's famous Penny-Postage scheme had got fairly under way, in the face of the bitter opposition of Lord Lowther—then the British Postmaster-General—and Lieut.-Col. Maberly, the Secretary, these officers took every opportunity to throw discredit on it, and that long after its success was certain. One method was to get up a fallacious report, which Col. Maberly did, by putting over £600,000 (\$3,000,000) of packet expenses into the Post-Office expenditures. This was a naval expenditure, given for naval purposes, and though the packets carried the mails, it had never been reckoned among the Post-Office expenses at all. But by this report the profits of the Post-Office, which, before the penny postage, amounted to over four million dollars, appeared to have disappeared altogether. Mr. Hill showed the Parliamentary Committee that this was a false return, and the Secretary was forced to admit it. Col. Maberly, not long after, had full leave to retire from the postal service; and Mr. Rowland Hill is now the virtual head of the English Post-Office Department. The lesson is one Mr. Campbell might profit by.

But let us give the Postmaster-General credit for proposing one thing that will add something to the funds of the Department. He has not the courage to advise the abolition of the franking privilege, nor the honesty to propose that Government should pay for transporting its own matter. The Post-Office is a mill to grind the grist for those who enjoy a "little brief authority," but the toll is all taken out of the people's corn. The only way that the funds can be obtained is to raise the postage rates. That is his proposition. He does not like the idea that poor people, honest farmers, and laborious mechanics should get their weekly newspaper, their religious journal, or their literary magazine at one half the rates of transient matter, on condition that they pay the postage in advance. This reduction on regular papers and periodicals by the law of 1852 is a perpetual eye-sore to our Post-Office chief. He speaks of it as a "special privilege" to a "particular class," as if the benefit of low postage did not extend to the inmates of every house and log-cabin from Astorhook to Astoria. And how much does he propose to make by raising this class of postage? We will see. Printed matter furnishes to the postal revenue \$638,927; and a large share of this, a third or more, is transient, leaving say \$400,000 for the postage on regular newspapers and periodicals. By the Postmaster-General's proposition this sum would be doubled, giving an increase of income to the amount of \$400,000. Is there a man at Washington who is such a very simpleton as to believe the people of the United States are going to pay a higher postage on their literary, religious and political intelligence—as necessary as their daily bread—and that, too, while one million eight hundred thousand dollars is added on the Post-Office by the same swindle? It can't be done, Mr. Campbell.

This Report travels out of its course to read a lecture to Congress on the propriety of discontinuing the present rate of pay to the Collins line of steamers. We cannot be accused of being in the interest of the Collins Company, as our course on this subject is well known. Mr. Campbell considers the continuance of the present compensation "a mere gratuity." Unless Mr. Campbell can show that he is Secretary of the Navy, or special protector of the Treasury Department, we beg to remind him that his advice on the compensation to the Collins Steamship Company is purely gratuitous. The money for starting and keeping up the various lines of ocean steamers is in the navy estimate, and does not affect the Post-Office balance sheet at all. But why does not Mr. Campbell give us statements and make suggestions on necessary improvements of the mail service, and the increase of mail facilities to the people?

The truth is, that there is not a single sensible recommendation in this Report, not a proposition of relief for the people, who not only use the mails, but who own the Post-Office, the Government, and the country. A direct robbery of \$1,800,000 on their pockets is starved over and left to eat out their substance till some able hand cuts it up root and branch. All this is left, while it is recommended that \$400,000 additional tax should be laid upon the intellectual life of the nation. How long must red tape, routine, and incapacity stand in the way of our intellectual progress, our business interests, and our daily wants?

## WAR WITH ENGLAND.

The recently-published documents on the Clayton-Bulwer treaty are of such extensive dimensions as to lead to the supposition that matter of such magnitude must contain something of vital consequence. Especially is this the case considering the grave tone of the President's Message on that topic. But we can assure our readers that all the interminable disquisitions, past, present and future, on this question, like Gen. Cass's fire-hundred-times-repeated declaration on the Oregon question, that "War with England is inevitable," will come to naught. Mr. Polk at that time stood

on the ground of "54 40 or fight," but came down to 49 the moment it was found best to concede to that line. It will be just so now. All the talk about the violation of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, the application of the Monroe doctrine to the colonization of the Island of Ruatan by England, will evaporate like the breath of the utterers. We may, and doubtless shall, for the twentieth time refute our national fathers and strut proudly before the universe, but we shall imitate the example of the bird from whom we derive the example of such an exhibition of pluck—quickly do use them when anything really serious threatens. Yet the country must have been struck by the singularly unanimous tone of the Senate the other day, when the Message was read, in backing up its apparently warlike demonstrations. Various gentlemen expressed their approval of its lofty tone touching our foreign affairs. It received the endorsement of the Privileged Class in the warm plaudits of Mr. Toombs of Georgia, who aims to be the exemplar and spokesman of the peculiar institution. Mr. Seward, too, not to be outdone in patriotism—for no man is a truer patriot than he—declared himself with equal distinctness for the execution of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, and for the assertion of the Monroe doctrine. On their face these demonstrations seem belligerent, but they are really the most harmless of proceedings. Mr. Seward has not yet told us whether he deems the failure to relinquish the Mosquito protectorate by England an infraction of the treaty; neither has he told us whether, in his judgment, the occupation of Ruatan can be taken to be a violation of the Monroe doctrine. The point in that question is, whether its occupation did not precede the assertion of that celebrated dictum. Yet Mr. Seward and the party he represents will go as far as the farthest in maintaining the honor and the just pretensions of the country—further, indeed, than any representative of the slaveholding interest will go, when the action is in the direction of provoking the hostility of a powerful foreign nation. But we are at present in no danger from a war with any but weak powers without allies, and for this best of reasons—that the Privileged Class will not permit it. The slaveholders have not the least fancy for a war with England, and their efforts till the crack of doom will be to avert such a catastrophe. They do not want to lose their chattels at present. They have the Administration and one branch of Congress, and pretty nearly, if not quite, a controlling influence in the other. Let nobody lose any sleep, therefore, in the vain apprehension that this or any other Administration of a similar kidney will be really in earnest in provoking an actual collision with England or any other first-rate power. They know better.

## THE CLAYTON AND BULWER TREATY.

We have already alluded to the fact that Mr. Clayton's asseverations touching the intentions of the negotiators of the Clayton and Bulwer Treaty, just taken with several grains of allowance. For our own part we believe that it was never the intention or expectation of the British negotiator of the treaty to surrender the Protectorate of Great Britain over the Mosquitoes. We believe that Mr. Clayton never approached this topic in his negotiations with Mr. Bulwer, knowing full well the position which that Minister occupied on that point; but that he cautiously avoided it, intending to obtain by indirection and diplomatic wiles what he knew would not be knowingly yielded in unequivocal terms. We have reason to believe that Mr. Clayton chuckled not a little at what he deemed his success over the British diplomatist, and was not altogether complimentary in the terms he applied to the astuteness of that functionary. Mr. Clayton flattered himself on his phraseology in the treaty, and thought he had Mr. Bulwer fast on the point of surrendering the Protectorate. Mr. Bulwer came with prestige as a sharp and knowing man in diplomacy, and Mr. Clayton claimed the honor of having quite out-generaled him. Mr. Clayton believed, or professed to believe, that the terms used by him in the treaty, by which Great Britain was not to "colonize, fortify or exercise dominion in Central America," included her Mosquito protectorate.

But Lord Clarendon denies the fact, and denies the intention, with what we believe to be great truthfulness. And he intimates very distinctly that Mr. Clayton knew perfectly well during the negotiation of the treaty that neither the British Government nor Mr. Bulwer ever had any intention of relinquishing the protectorate. And here we wish to take occasion to do the justice to Mr. Webster, of saying that he penetrated at once and distinctly the designs of our negotiation, and saw the intentions and comprehended the acts of the British Minister, and that believing the treaty did not do what it was alleged it did by our side, declined, while Secretary of State, to take any steps toward furthering Mr. Clayton's and Mr. Cass's interpretation of it. As between the two diplomats, we think it is a plain case of the biter being bit. Mr. Clayton thought he had entrapped Sir Henry Bulwer, while the fact is that the boot was on the other leg. It was a struggle for generalship in the use of terms, which is ever the chief contest of diplomats. Mr. Clayton thought he won, but it turns out but too plainly that he did not. The treaty does not exclude and destroy the protectorate, and if that particular thing is to be done the job will have to be begun *de novo*. A new treaty must be made, and in it the end aimed at must be called by its true name.

By way of eliciting (we were going to say the facts of the case, but we are not sure this can be done by the progress) some additional light on the subject, it would be useful for some inquisitive man in the Senate to catechize Mr. Clayton closely on the points we have advanced. Let us see what he will have to say touching his verbal communications with Sir H. Bulwer on the point of the relinquishment of the British protectorate over the Mosquitoes. Did the subject ever enter into the deliberations and discussions of the two officials? Did Mr. Clayton ever ask or suggest and did Sir H. Bulwer ever concede or refuse the surrender of the protectorate? Mr. Clayton is now in the Senate, and seemingly not unwilling to be interpellated on the subject. There never can be a better opportunity to get at a statement of the facts from our late distinguished Secretary. Let us have it. It will help to enliven a grave discussion. Perhaps it will serve to draw out a rejoinder statement from Sir Henry Bulwer. Perhaps a question of veracity will be started which will result in pregnant revelations of the arts of diplomacy. Let us have Mr. Clayton on the witness-stand in respect to the particular point of his verbal or other discussions with Sir H. Bulwer on the Mosquito Protectorate.

The Washington correspondent of *The Boston Post* writes that Gov. Shannon of Kansas is shortly expected at Washington, and that he is also expected

to resign. Of course, now that he has lost the favor of the Border Ruffians, the only choice is to resign or be turned out. It is not to be supposed that he can be forgiven at Washington for presuming to fraternize as he did with the Free-State men at Lawrence. The correspondent of *The Post* adds that a representative of the people of Kansas—by which we presume he means the Border Ruffians—is already at Washington to solicit the appointment of Woodson, the present Secretary of State, in Shannon's place. This Woodson has been from the beginning a supple tool of the Ruffians, and is understood to have been very active in promoting the late invasion.

## THE PURITAN FATHERS.

An article on the Fathers of New-England, in the last number of *The Edinburgh Review*, appears to have caused a good deal of fluttering, and to have furnished a special topic at the late Plymouth celebration of Forefathers Day. Two men, from the most opposite quarters—men whose sensations at finding themselves shoulder to shoulder in a common cause, must have been a little queer—stepped forward on that occasion to the rescue of the Pilgrims—Edward Everett and Wendell Phillips—and their respective methods of doing battle with the Edinburgh reviewer were highly characteristic. Mr. Everett not venturing to be personally present at the festival, being kept away perhaps by not very agreeable experiences on some recent similar public occasions, sent from his ambush at Boston a toast, leveled at the Edinburgh reviewer, the text perhaps of one of those youthful sermons, the delivery of which used to be so taking with the Boston ladies.—"Let him that is without sin among you cast the first stone." This is a very fair specimen of Mr. Everett's customary policy of running away in the first place, and as he runs, contriving to get a shot at the enemy from under cover of some lurking place; but it is a sort of *argumentum ad hominem* that would make pretty short work with all criticisms, while it would reduce the business of writing leading articles almost to a sinecure; so that, of course, we at least, can't be expected to subscribe to it.

Mr. Phillips, in a style equally characteristic, boldly takes the bull by the horns. Even he, however, does not venture to defend the New-England fathers as faultless, or to deny their rabid intolerance, which is the great fault charged against them. He attempts to justify the eulogies, of which in New-England those fathers are the yearly, half-yearly, quarterly, monthly, weekly, daily, and we might even say hourly objects. A sort of family worship of them, so to speak, having been regularly instituted, he attempts to vindicate this worship on the ground—what ground, reader, do you suppose?—on the ground that we are to see in the New-England fathers, not themselves merely or chiefly, but their posterity—the men of New-England of to-day.

To the good old Calvinistic doctrine that Adam sinned and fell not for himself only, but in a representative capacity, as the federal head of all his posterity, or as the New-England Primer expresses it:

"In Adam's fall we sinned all—"

Mr. Phillips, who adheres, we believe, to the Westminster catechisms as embodied into the New-England platform, now proposes to add in his character, we suppose, of one of the new lights, the idea of a retroactive salvation for the fathers by virtue of the merits of the children! Had Mr. Everett hit upon this new method of whitewashing the sepulchers of the prophets, we should not have been in the least surprised at it; but in the mouth of Mr. Wendell Phillips it seems to us most ridiculously out of place. Has it not been almost the sole business of Mr. Phillips and of the set to which he belongs for at least these fifteen years past to represent the whole body of their fellow countrymen of the United States, and especially those of New-England, as utterly dead in trespasses and sins—the best of the New-England clergy as dumb dogs that do not bark, and the greater part of them as dogs that bark, and bite too? How comes it, then, that Mr. Wendell Phillips is smitten with such sudden admiration for the living sons of New-England, and especially for the late Speaker and Senator, Mr. Robert C. Winthrop, whom, being there present, he singled out as a specimen of the sons whose virtues were to serve as a cloak for the weaknesses of the fathers? It is probable, indeed, that this was but an ironical compliment, but if so, the irony is fatal to the argument.

The lapse of time and the recuperative power of nature have partially relieved the children of New-England of the characteristic deformity of the fathers. Great things are to be expected in this point of view of the rising generation; but in the generation already on the stage the family deformity is quite too plainly to be traced. With all the superiority of New-England in intelligence, education, refinement and humanity—a superiority too evident to be denied—there is no part of the country of which the intolerant, narrow, bigoted and proscriptive policy of the Know-Nothings has taken such hold; and how is this to be accounted for except that the original sin of the fathers still mars and vitiates the affections of the children?

The great merit of the New-England Fathers consisted in their pertinacious adherence to what they judged to be right, even at the greatest hazards and most serious sacrifices. For that let them have all due honor. Yet the liberty for which they struggled was, after all, but the very narrowest sort of liberty—liberty for themselves, liberty for the members of the Congregational churches. For liberty for anybody else, for liberty for all, however two or three more enlightened souls among them may have hit upon the idea, the great body and prevailing party of the New-England Fathers had no inclination whatever; but, on the contrary, held it in utter abhorrence. And so ingrained is this trait of bitter and narrow sectarianism into the New-England constitution, that hardly two, three or half a dozen New-England men can be pointed out at this moment who are entirely free from the blemish of it. Mr. Phillips will pardon us for saying, with all due respect for him and his associates, that it is the easily besetting, cherished, and for that reason most disastrous sin and weakness of himself and the party with which he acts.

We cannot close without taking occasion to protest against that perpetual burning of incense to the names of ancestors, kept up with quite as much pertinacity in New-England as in China or Japan. As in those countries, so in New-England even the Free-Thinkers, who look upon other forms of worship with philosophical indifference, easily fall into this. But it is objectionable every way; not in one of its least evils that it is giving rise to a species of literature as fulsome, as empty, and as rhetorically rapid as the wretched panegyrical orations of the Greeks—as utterly regardless of the truth of history and as fatal to it, so far as the mass of the community is concerned, as the romances of

chivalry or the religious legends of the middle ages.

Gov. Gardner's Message to the Massachusetts Legislature shows two things very plainly: First, that he is still a candidate for the Vice-Presidency; Secondly, that if he fails in that object he intends to sell out the Know-Nothing party to the Hunker Whigs. Not only his attack upon the Personal Liberty bill, but every identical recommendation of the Message looks precisely in that direction. Can the leopard change his spots? We greatly fear that the old Liberty party men by whose votes Gov. Gardner was re-elected have this time caught a wild-cat. His earnest recommendation to diminish the number of the Representatives is very characteristic. In the first place, such a reduction would tend to increase the relative political power of the large towns where capital is most influential and the Hunkers most powerful. In the second place, it would greatly assist the operations of political intrigues. The large number of the Massachusetts Representatives increases the difficulty of buying up a majority, and has always been a formidable obstacle in the way of maneuvers of the Gardner school.

The Massachusetts Know-Nothings do not make very successful progress as yet in their efforts to disfranchise the foreign population. The Legislature of last year, in its zeal for this object, recommended an amendment to the Constitution "that no person" should be entitled to vote in this Commonwealth "unless he shall have been a resident within the jurisdiction of the United States twenty-one years, and legally naturalized." Should this amendment be adopted the effect would be that none but naturalized persons would be allowed to vote. Gov. Gardner recommends to drop this proviso, and commence anew. It is dangerous for Know-Nothings to meddle with edge-tools, and it is greatly to be apprehended that this sagacious party will end in Massachusetts as elsewhere, with cutting off its own head.

## FROM WASHINGTON.

## THE FACTIONISTS IN THE HOUSE.

Editorial Correspondence of *The N. Y. Tribune*.

WASHINGTON, Thursday, Jan. 3, 1856.

Another day's struggle in the House has left it disorganized as it found it—another week (the fifth) of the Session draws to a close with no promise of any result. The House is still incapable of doing any of the business devolved on it by the Constitution and the country; the Senate necessarily awaits the organization of the House. Foreign War may lower as intestine strife so recently did—but the House remains headless, unqualified, incompetent for any good purpose. Why so? I answer—

1. Because several Members elected as opponents of the policy respecting Slavery Extension embodied in Douglas's Nebraska bill have betrayed their trust, proved false to their express or implied pledges, and vote for one or another candidate who stands expressly pledged to acquiescence in or active support of the Douglas-Nebraska policy; and

2. Because men who still claim to be Anti-Nebraska vote steadily against the candidate of the great body of the Anti-Nebraska Members, and so prevent a choice; and

3. Because men who vote uniformly for Banks constantly intrigue to defeat him; nightly caballing against him, threatening to bid, swearing they will vote for him no longer, and giving secret and confident assurances to his open and manly adversaries that the Banks vote will soon break up and exhorting them to hold out against a Plurality rule or any course which may result in his election.

Such are the facts as I know them, and as the Country should understand them. Had all the men voting for Banks in good faith supported him, he would have been chosen days ago. He has not been simply because some men who were morally bound to support the Anti-Nebraska candidate would not, while others who have pretended to support him secretly plotted and conspired to defeat him. Night after night they in secret conclave resolve to bolt next day; but when the time has arrived to fulfill their resolve their hearts fail them and the resolves which they have caused to be telegraphed to distant points are falsified by their acts. So the Democrats who want the House organized are kept voting solid against a plurality rule in the daily hope that the Banks column will speedily break and give them a chance to elect Orr if not Richardson.

In view of these facts, ought our friends to give way and abandon Banks?

If it were merely a question between three conflicting parties, no one having a majority, I would say, do the best that is practicable, and not waste time in chase of impossibilities. If there were objections to Mr. Banks's qualifications, I would be the first to insist that they be well considered. If it were objected that he holds extreme opinions, and so is obnoxious to men whose votes are necessary, I should consider that a reason for reviewing our position. But it is not pretended by a single Member that Mr. Banks is poorly qualified for Speaker—it is not even asserted that any other Member is better qualified. That he is the first choice to-day of a very large majority of the Anti-Nebraska Members is undoubted; his opponents dare not call nor attend a Nominating Caucus held under a pledge that its decision shall be conclusive. And so far is he from holding an ultra position, that there are just about as many who object that he is not reliable and trustworthy in his opposition to the Douglas policy as there are who base their hostility to him on his alleged "fanaticism," which they deduce from the fact that he represents a rural district of Massachusetts.

Should Mr. Banks be dropped and some other man of our side elected, that man would owe his elevation to the course pursued by Messrs. Dunn, Scott Harrison, Scott, John Wheeler, &c. No matter what he might profess, he would be their Speaker, elected because they kept the House disorganized till the majority were brought to surrender their choice. He would be morally obligated to give them influential positions on Committees. Is this desirable?

Whatever the Country thinks on this subject of dropping Mr. Banks and taking up some man whom Dunn & Co. will vote for, I urge that its sentiment be promptly and clearly expressed. Let every citizen who has an opinion on the subject embody it in a letter to his Representative, wherever it may be practicable to express the prevailing sentiment through a Public Meeting—whether called on purpose or not—let that course be taken. Let Congress speedily hear whether the Anti-Nebraska voters throughout the country want Mr. Banks dropped now or sustained to the end.

FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.

WASHINGTON, Thursday, Jan. 3, 1856.

Although the House made no practical progress to-day toward the election of Speaker, still the pro-

ceedings were not destitute of interest, and displayed some of the partially concealed motives which have been known to those behind the scenes as operating materially upon the canvass. It has been announced more than once, through this correspondence, that the Southern-Americans have desired an opportunity of receding from their present position, and of uniting upon some candidate idealized in principle with their own sectional purpose. Hence, it was that some of them were even willing to ignore the insult contained in the Democratic platform, and to rally upon Mr. Richardson with all his avowed Anti-Know-Nothing sins. Nothing but the restraint imposed by such leaders as Col. Marshall deterred this manifestation of defection long ago. Occasionally the rank and file have broken the trammels of party discipline and exhibited a disregard of the policy which had been marked out at the beginning of this contest.

Mr. Walker of Alabama signaled this disposition for emancipation this morning by offering a resolution to elect Mr. Boyce of South Carolina, the most open and ultra Secessionist in the House, Speaker. The proposition was followed by amendments to substitute the names of Mr. Banks, Mr. Pennington and Mr. Leites, who peremptorily withdrew his name, and subsequently, by a motion to lay the whole matter on the table, which ultimately prevailed by a majority of nearly two to one. At first the Democracy fell into the trap upon the text motion—that of laying on the table—and sustained it pretty generally; but when Mr. Cobb of Alabama discovered that the "South Americans"—as he calls them—did not follow in the track of their self-constituted leader, Mr. Walker, he changed his vote, and the example found hosts of imitators, much to the amusement of the House. In fact, there was a complete change of front, and the record was but a register of retreats. The whole difficulty was occasioned by an apprehension that the vote on the amendments would bring the chamber to an alternative of choice between Mr. Banks and Mr. Pennington.

There was a good deal of sharpshooting under the ten minutes' rule, and Mr. Simmons of New-York, in a few straightforward and sensible remarks, exposed the disunion position of Mr. Boyce, showing that though the South affected great horror of "Black Republicanism," according to their own declarations the difference between the two was limited, except that one represented Northern sentiment and the other Southern.

Mr. Galloway of Ohio made a capital hit which brought down the House. He was demonstrating that Freedom constituted in this country the only true and vital distinction of that "Nationality," which had been in so much harped upon, and illustrated this view by reciting the preamble to the Constitution, which declares the object of the Union, to "secure the blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our posterity." Dr. Marshall of Ky., interrupted him by inquiring if "niggers" were included in this posterity? "Yes," retorted Mr. Galloway quickly, "perhaps in yours, but not in ours." The point was made with wonderful effect of manner, and flashed through the hall and galleries with electric rapidity. The Southern Member who hardly repeat the experiment in a hurry of running a tilt against Saml. Galloway.

A vast work is about to be undertaken in Mexico, which will do more to revolutionize that country effectually and for permanent good than all the political schemes that might be undertaken in the century to come. It is the construction of a railroad from Vera Cruz to the City of Mexico—some 200 miles. British, French and Mexican capitalists are principally interested in this great scheme; but of course American enterprise will cooperate in advancing an undertaking which, in its results, must be so advantageous to our commerce and connections. \$6,000,000 have already been subscribed by firms in the City of Mexico, and it is not proposed to issue bonds upon the construction as it progresses, after the now prevalent fashion, but to build only upon *bona fide* capital. \$12,000,000 is the estimate cost of the whole road. The work will be commenced about the middle of March, beginning at the City of Mexico. An American Superintendent, familiar with the building of railroads in the United States, and a corps of American Engineers, are about to start for this destination, in order to commence the preliminary operations immediately. Some of the most distinguished men and the ablest financiers in Mexico have enlisted in the enterprise, and secured it that material aid while so necessary to success.

Gen. A. Monto, the present Mexican Minister here, is understood to favor the project, and will contribute the influence of his admitted ability to advance its completion. He will return to Mexico as soon as his successor, who is expected within a fortnight, shall be installed.

No indication has yet been given as to the appointment of a Minister to London, nor has Mr. Buchanan signified recently any intention of returning to the United States in accordance with the desire which he expressed some time ago. He was quite willing to remain abroad until the President's Message reached England, and especially until the publication of his correspondence on the Central American question; counting largely upon the popular effect it would produce here, and upon its impression, too, on Parliament, now about to assemble. Both these objects will soon be attained, but it is now doubted whether he will even then come home as was anticipated. His political friends consider it expedient for him to remain abroad until Spring at least, and have so advised him in order to avoid embarrassing complications which must necessarily arise in an approaching canvass for the Presidential nomination.

In regard to his successor there are many speculations, but no well-founded opinion. The President has been inclined strongly toward Mr. Mason of Virginia before his recent reflection to the Senate, and notwithstanding his "double" being at Paris. Had that contingency happened, it is quite probable the latter would have had leave to make his *cogit* to Louis Napoleon. The purpose has been entertained of exchanging Mr. Vroom, now at Berlin, to London, but not with any definite seriousness. And ex-Gov. Seymour of New-York is still under consideration at times. The number of aspirants will multiply amazingly, now that nominating conventions are to meet and the Presidential game is opening more earnestly. ISM.

## THE LATEST NEWS.

## RECEIVED BY

## MAGNETIC TELEGRAPH.

## THE SPEAKERSHIP.

Editorial Correspondence of *The Tribune*.

WASHINGTON, Friday, Jan. 4, 1856.

The vote for Banks to-day was as strong as